

### Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <a href="http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content">http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content</a>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Nations shall learn war no more.

## THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

A MONTHLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF PEACE BETWEEN INDIVIDUALS, CLASSES AND NATIONS.

# SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, ONE DOLLAR A YEAR. SINGLE NUMBERS, TEN CENTS.

Address all communications to

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY,
3 Somerset Street, Boston, Mass.

### THE RECONSTRUCTION OF HISTORY.

Among the resolutions passed at the Chicago Peace Congress was one in which these words occur: "It is most desirable that there should be such a revision of manuals of instruction as will eliminate false and misleading representations of the nature of war and inculcate the true principles lying at the basis of social order, and which should govern the nations in their relations one to another."

No sooner had the Congress closed than we found going the rounds of the press both religious and secular a curious and somewhat embarrassing perversion of the action taken on this subject. The Churchman, whose utterance was copied by many journals, made the matter the subject of a somewhat extended editorial commencing thus: "One of the propositions seriously advanced at the Chicago Peace Congress looked to an appeal to the churches for the omission of military terms from their vocabularies, military metaphors from their oratory and hymnody and military titles from their nomenclature." Many of the daily papers, which in other respects treated the Congress with great courtesy and fairness, proceeded to read it a lecture on its folly, others to ridicule its simplicity and still others to bemoan the fact that so wise a body had unfortunately gone "a little too far."

It would, indeed, have been unfortunate if the Peace Congress had recommended the impossible as well as undesirable task of doing what is indicated in the quotation given above. Suffice it to say that no such proposition ever came before the Congress at all. Though present at all the sessions we do not remember any utterance of any speaker which could have been construed by the most facile reporter into such a meaning. Several speakers alluded to the false notions of war given in books of history, in much of the instruction in the schools and even in the churches and Sunday-schools. But these remarks, though pointed and earnest, were invariably

within the bounds of reason and good sense, as any one may see who will take the trouble to read them. What ex-Governor John W. Hoyt said may be found in his address given in full on another page of this number. General Charles H. Howard, who commanded a brigade in the civil war and who still believes, if we mistake not, that war may sometimes be a necessity rendering it right, in an address which we wish every American could read, said: "The history of wars as usually written does not tend to prevent their repetition. . . . The romance and glory of campaigns and battles are made to glow in the narrative. . . . History as hitherto written only helps on the infatuation which

'Seeks the bubble reputation in the cannon's mouth.'
Unless mankind shall produce a war literature different from that of the historian as now known and read, Whittier's lines will continue to be both historic and prophetic:

'Still shall the glory and the pomp of war Along their train the shouting millions draw,'" etc.

What the opponents of war desire is not the omission of military metaphors and terms from oratory and hymnody. They themselves use such metaphors and terms with the greatest freedom, when they speak of "war against war," etc. They know quite as well as their critics, possibly a little better, the difference between the metaphorical and the literal use of language, and they object to the use of metaphors, terms and titles taken from war only when they are employed, as they often are, to uphold the barbarous and inhuman system of man-killing. The use of such titles by a body like the Salvation Army, which is opposed to all war and fighting and is one of the soundest peace organizations in existence, is to them in no wise objectionable.

The reconstruction of history and of instruction in the schools and of the teaching of the pulpit and of the press, which we advocate may be summed up in the following way:

- 1. History should be re-written, with much less attention given to the deeds of war than heretofore in the books of history. No one asks that the wars be left out entirely. They are, unfortunately, a part of the history of the world which cannot now be changed, and they should be properly noted. Heretofore they have monopolized nearly the whole attention of the historian and the real history of humanity, of peoples and nations, has been largely ignored. The thing to be done is to relegate wars to their proper place and to write into the forefront of the account the history of education, of religion, of law, of art, of science, of language, of literature, of discovery and invention, of agriculture, of commerce, of manufactures, and the like. No one denies that these constitute the best side of history and make up the larger part of it.
  - 2. When the history of wars is written they should be

treated not as a part of the normal activity and development of men and nations, but as something abnormal and deplorable; not as a means of progress and civilization, but, as in most cases they have been, a cause of reckless waste and destruction, of immorality and crime, of deterioration of individual and national life. The point of view being thus changed and corrected, the idea of painting war in brilliant and attractive colors would seem to the historian and his readers like decking out a skeleton or a carcass in ribbons and lace. Even in those cases where the historian might think some particular war right and justifiable he would no longer write with a gleeful spirit of its bloody deeds, but would describe it in the sombre way in which one ordinarily describes the amputation of a limb or the cutting out of an eye.

1894.

- 3. When history is taught in the schools it should always be from this point of view. The lesson should be impressed upon children that men and communities and nations were intended to help one another, to live together in good-fellowship, and that every quarrel and fight and war is a violation of their duty one to another. In this way, even with the present books of history, very much might be done to train the boys and girls in the love of peace and the dislike of war. With this sort of instruction, given in a simple pictorial way, the love of drum and sword and war-gun would be greatly diminished, as the children would instinctively connect them with the horrors of the battlefield, from which the average human mind, unhardened, naturally turns away with disgust. All we ask is that wars may be treated by the teacher in the same spirit that ordinary quarreling and fighting are treated.
- 4. In the pulpit and the press the glorification of military heroes as such should cease. The services to the cause of freedom and humanity of such men as Washington and Grant, and of many common soldiers who have gone to meet death bravely in the cause of right, can be properly appreciated and honored without the least glorification of war, which is always, in the last analysis, the same unspeakably horrible thing. If the press and the pulpit would always speak of war and armies in the spirit in which Grant and Washington spoke of them, it would be an immense service to humanity, and it would not be long till there would be little occasion to speak of them at all.

This reconstruction of history and of instruction is already beginning. Several attempts have been made to recast school histories from the point of view indicated above. The task is not an easy one. It will require the finest historical talent to gather and properly arrange the materials, but success is sure to come, and it is not improbable that the next really great work of history will be of this character. The public conscience is rapidly changing, and evidences of it are beginning to appear in literature, the pulpit, the press and the schools.

#### THE TEACHING OF PATRIOTISM.

Mr. J. B. Upham of the Youth's Companion is endeavoring to secure a uniform celebration of Washington's birthday in the public schools of the land. Many teachers are becoming interested and are lending their hearty cooperation. A program for the celebration of the day in the schools has been prepared by Mrs. A. G. Lewis. Copies of this program may be had by addressing Mr. Upham. Following is the eleventh performance in the sixth section of the program:

11. Bearer of the Flag of Peace, taking place beside previous speaker.

Side by side with our emblem of liberty we welcome the noble Flag of Peace. Upon this pure white border we write the legend "Peace on earth, good will to men." Under its folds we know no North, no South, no East, and no West; but one United Land; two continents with hands clasped across the seas in universal friendship.

The schools are our country's future; so long as our schools are true to our flag and the principles it represents, our country will be safe. Let us then, one and all, in the presence of this group of flags, which have, each in turn, borne upon its folds the fortunes of our republic from its birth up to the present hour, and in memory of our noble Washington, who stands before the world as our country's most honored defender,—let us pledge anew our allegiance to the flag of '94, the crowning banner of our Beloved America.

Bearers of the Flags of 1894 and of Peace remain in the centre of the semi-circle. They raise these flags aloft. Other color-bearers drop their flags so that the points of the staffs rest upon the floor. Then all color-bearers recite in unison:

"Flag of the sun that shines for all,
Flag of the breeze that blows for all,
Flag of the sea that flows for all,
Flag of the SCHOOL that stands for all,
Flag of the people, one and all,—
Hail! flag of Liberty! all hail!
HAIL, glorious years to come!"

At the word "HAIL," which begins the last line, the whole school rises, and as soon as the color-bearers have finished the line, all join them in repeating the address to the flag ("Flag of the Sun," etc.), taking care to speak quietly and slowly, while all eyes, without exception, are directed toward the flags that are held aloft.

Patriotism can certainly be taught in such a way as to inculcate at the same time love and respect for other nations. This program takes a step in the right direction. Some parts of it, we think, can be improved, but it will be of inestimable value to the boys and girls of the country simply to see the beautiful white-bordered flag floating before them as the symbol of the new spirit of love and brotherhood, which is by and by to drive out sectionalism and to destroy the old and deep-seated animosities which have so long kept the nations armed for mutual destruction.

We wish that every patriotic American, who reveres the father of his country, would on the 22nd of February read carefully what Washington said in his farewell address about the danger of standing armies and their